

Serial No. 09/804,249

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-6 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been amended in response thereto. Support for the claim amendments may be found on page 20, line 26 to page 21, line 12, page 21, line 23-25, page 22, lines 1-14 and in FIGS. 2, 4 and 8.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,848 issued to Arnold in view of U.S. patent No. 5,905,495 issued to Tanaka et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Tanaka") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0029275 issued to Selgas et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Selgas"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Arnold teaches, in element 212 of FIG. 2, that an "attachment meeting certain criteria (e.g., message size, number of recipients, etc.) is automatically detached 210, placed on a remote site 212, preferably a Web server, and substituted with a pointer to the Web server 214" (column 4, line 19-23), but fails to teach where the Web server is located.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "attached file transferring means for transferring the attached file ... **retrieved from the external server by the attached file retrieving means to the internal server**" (emphasis added) at lines 23-25 and "the external server being connected outside of a network protected from outside" at lines 8-9. Claim 1 also recites "transfer management information removing means for removing the store location information of the external server, the user account of the external server, and the password of the external server from the electronic mail" at lines 12-14. Since Arnold is silent with respect to the location of the Web server, and does not provide a teaching or suggestion regarding an external server, Arnold is similarly silent regarding "removing the store location information of the external server" as recited in claim 1.

Serial No. 09/804,249

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 as well as claims 3 and 4, which depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Arnold, because Arnold is silent with respect to where the Web server is located and fails to teach "attached file transferring means for transferring the attached file ... retrieved from the external server by the attached file retrieving means to the internal server" where "the external server being connected outside of a network protected from outside" or the management of an external server, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 5 recites "transferring the attached file ... retrieved from the external server by the attached file retrieving means to the internal server" (lines 21-23) where "the external server being connected outside of a network protected form outside" (line 9) and "the internal server being connected inside of the network"(line 17). In addition, claim 5 recites "removing the store location information of the external server, the user account of the external server, and the password of the external server from the electronic mail" at lines 12-14. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over Arnold, Tanaka and Selgas.

Claim 6 recites "transferring the attached file ... retrieved from the external server to a predetermined server using the user account of the internal server" (lines 18-19) where "the internal server being connected inside of the network" (line 14). Claim 6 also recites "removing the first store location information, the first user account, and the first password from the electronic mail" at lines 9-10. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over Arnold, Tanaka and Selgas, alone or in combination.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 15 recites "retrieving a file attached to an electronic mail message from an external server located outside a protected network" at lines 2-3 and "storing the file after said retrieving on the internal server using the internal storage location, the internal user account and the internal password" at lines 9-10. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Arnold, Tanaka and Selgas, alone or in combination.

Summary

Claims 1 and 3-6 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 09/804,249

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

December 11, 2007

By:

David E. Moore
David E. Moore
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on December 11, 2007

STAAS & HALSEY

By: [Signature]Date: 12/11/07